

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-21 remain in the application. Claims 1-21 are subject to examination. Claims 1 and 10 have been amended.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112" on pages 2 and 3 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 1-9 and 11-21 have been rejected as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

It is respectfully stated that original claim language may have caused unnecessary confusion. Perhaps an explanation will be helpful. The input differential amplifier is identified by reference numeral 1 and the offset compensation circuit is identified by reference numerals 2 and 7. It is believed that when viewed from this perspective, the claim language makes more sense. Claim 1 has been amended to more logically present the claim language.

In regards to claim 4, the further differential amplifier is shown by reference numeral 2.

In regards to claim 11, claim 11 modifies or further defines the integrator 8 and the differential amplifier 3. The

differential amplifier 2 or the integrator 7 are not believed to be necessary in regards to claim 10 as only one of the two compensation circuits is being claimed (e.g. the circuit will function without the second feedback loop or offset compensation circuit).

It is accordingly believed that the claims meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The above-noted changes to the claims are provided solely for clarification or cosmetic reasons. The changes are neither provided for overcoming the prior art nor do they narrow the scope of the claim for any reason related to the statutory requirements for a patent.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102" on pages 3-4 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 1-3, 10 and 21 have been rejected as being fully anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,081,162 to Johnson (hereinafter Johnson) under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

As the Examiner states Johnson teaches an input differential amplifier 108 generating first and second amplified signals, first and second inverters 112A, 112B and an offset compensation circuit 116. However as clearly shown in Figs. 1-3 the offset compensation circuit 116 does not receive and

compensate the output signals 115A and 115B from the
inverters 112A, 112B.

In contrast, claim 1 of the instant application recites this feature "an offset compensation circuit coupled to said first and said second inverters and adjusting a difference between the two output clock signals to a constant value".

In regards to claim 10, Johnson is not believed to teach the limitation of "a control circuit receiving at least one of the first and second differential output clock signals, said control circuit driving said inverters and shifting the input pulse shapes of said inverters to the optimum switching point of said inverters". Support for the change to claim 10 can be found in Fig. 2 and as described on pages 18 and 19 of the specification of the instant application.

For the above stated reasons the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdrawn the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejection.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103" on page 5 of the above-identified Office Action, claim 20 has been rejected as being obvious over Johnson in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,362,737 to Rodgers et al. (hereinafter Rogers) under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claim 20 is based on amended claim 1. Amended claim 1 is believed to be allowable and therefore claim 20 is also believed to be allowable.

It is noted that the Office Action is silent as to claims 4-10 and 12-19. Are these claims allowable?

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claims 1 or 10. Claims 1 and 10 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art. The dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on claims 1 or 10.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-21 are solicited.

If an extension of time is required, petition for extension is herewith made. Any extension fee associated therewith should be charged to the Deposit Account of Lerner and Greenberg, P.A., No. 12-1099.

Appl. No. 10/622,937
Amdt. Dated October 28, 2004
Reply to Office Action of July 29, 2004

Please charge any other fees that might be due with respect
to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner
and Greenberg, P.A., No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,



For Applicants

REL:cgm

RALPH E. LOCHER
REG. NO. 41,947

October 28, 2004

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.
P.O. Box 2480
Hollywood, Florida 33022-2480
Tel.: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101